



# IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
<b>Date</b>	9th December 2014
<b>Time</b>	13:00
<b>Location</b>	Grafton House
<b>Present</b>	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) James Cutting (SCC) (JC) Karen Layer (IBC Planning Officer) (KL) Kenny Duncan (Crest Strategic Projects) (KD) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RC) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC)
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only
<b>Apologies</b>	Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) James Routledge (CBRE) John Terry (Crest) Dave Watson (SCC) Eddie Peters (IBC Parks and Open Spaces) Mike Taylor (IBC Urban Design and Conservation) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning)
<b>Minutes Agreed</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2015

### Items:

			<b>Attachments</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting</b>		Attached
1.1	ML went through the actions from the last meeting.		

1.2	Action 3.12 – outstanding.		
1.3	Action 3.16 – JC advised that additional school information to feed into SCC’s Secondary School Delivery note (circulated at 10 <sup>th</sup> September 2014 Steering Group Meeting) is still being worked on and involves approx. one month’s worth of additional work.		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Management and Governance Arrangements for IGS</b>		
2.1	RC explained that the IGS SPD sets out that the feasibility of transferring community assets to a management trust would be explored. As a result work was starting on investigating this matter further and Atlas were preparing a paper on the different options.		
2.2	FL commented that the paper focused on green space and areas coming forward for management, and the different options for adoption. Further discussion and input would be needed on costs, which will be undertaken in January. SC commented that all options could be included within the S106, which would keep options open and moving forward.		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Update on IGS matters since last Steering Group meeting. To include:-</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CBRE/Mersea Homes Planning application</b></li> <li>• <b>Crest’s response to CBRE/Mersea planning application</b></li> <li>• <b>Strategic Rail issues meeting</b></li> </ul>		
3.1	RC explained that an Extension of Time had been agreed and a project plan was being worked on. RC asked for an update on viability. SC advised that the viability was still being reviewed and timescale is ongoing. SC also stated that the assumptions included within the viability assessment were the same as those used in other recent applications considered by IBC.		
3.2	RC set out that responses had been received from Crest. Infrastructure deliverability was main issue. SC commented that there was nothing unexpected in comments. The TA was being worked through with SCC.		
3.3	RC commented that strategic items have been discussed at separate meetings. There was a meeting regarding strategic rail issues on 19 <sup>th</sup> November 2014 with Network Rail which included discussion on the provision of the bridges infrastructure as well as getting an understanding of rail improvement works and Network Rail’s response to CBRE/Mersea’s planning application. The notes of this meeting were circulated. A further meeting to discuss Network Rail’s response to the planning application is arranged for next week.		Note circulated at meeting


<p><b>4.0</b></p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p><b>4.7</b></p>	<p><b>IDP issues and suggested approach.</b></p> <p>RC advised that since last Steering Group meeting further work and discussion had taken place with relevant parties. As an outcome of this work a paper has been produced which proposes an approach to apportioning costs and delivery of strategic infrastructure items. RC explained the contents of the paper and the general approach of dividing costs equally between developers. Actions resulting from the paper included needing feedback from parties on the approach as well as determining how responsibility for individual items would be shared and further refinement of estimated costs needed.</p> <p>SC commented that how the infrastructure will be forward funded needs to be considered, which was agreed by FL. SC did agree that the approach discussed was a pragmatic approach and the principle of apportionment was fair but needed further work.</p> <p>JC commented that land value costs need to be agreed, they cannot all be based on a residential land value. SC said that the allocated land use affected the proposals put forward. SM commented that the SPD was based on proper planning and best land use so land values should reflect the allocations of land uses across IGS.</p> <p>KD said that the IDP appeared acceptable in principle but would impact on the viability.</p> <p>ML asked if cost upgrades for utilities had been obtained. RC said some information was available but not full information and queried whether this should be a development cost rather than infrastructure cost. KD said that either developers can club together to meet the cost or else last developer bares a greater disproportionate cost. RC suggested that separate utility meetings could be set up to pursue the matter further. ML commented that the length of project may not make pooling viable.</p> <p>It was agreed that KD and SC would need time to consider paper and feedback comments. SC advised he would respond after Christmas in time for next Steering Group meeting in January. KD agreed and would try to work together with Mersea to agree way forward based on the approach put forward.</p> <p><b>Action: KD and SC to feedback comments on IDP paper for next Steering Group Meeting in January.</b></p>		<p>Paper circulated at meeting</p>

<b>5.0</b>	<b>Steering Group meetings for 2015</b>		
5.1	It was agreed that regular meetings should be kept in diary and that first meeting should be in 2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of January.		
<b>5.2</b>	<b>RC to arrange for meetings to be set up on monthly basis for 2015.</b>		
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Freedom of Information (FOI)</b> - Minutes to not include any detail discussed that might prejudice the determination of the CBRE/Mersea planning application that is currently being considered by IBC.		
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>		
7.1	KD was asked whether there were any timeframes for starting discussions on planning for the Crest site. KD advised that there were a number of factors involved and at this stage it was not clear.		
7.2	KD asked whether the TA issues were being explored. SC advised that yes they were being looked at and meeting had been arranged with SCC to discuss.		
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b> – January 2015 – date to be confirmed.		

The full minutes of this meeting are assumed to be accessible to the public and to staff, unless the chair claims an exemption under the **Freedom of Information Act 2000**. For detailed guidance about applying the exemptions visit <http://www.ico.gov.uk/>

<b>Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.</b>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
<p>Remember that some exemptions can be overridden if it is in the public interest to disclose – as decided by the FOI multi-disciplinary team.</p> <p>Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the information may be released once the exemption lapses.</p>	1. That is <b>personal data</b>	
	2. Provided in <b>confidence</b>	
	3. Intended for <b>future publication</b>	x
	4. Related to <b>criminal proceedings</b>	
	5. That might prejudice <b>law enforcement</b>	
	6. That might prejudice ongoing <b>external audit</b> investigations	
	7. That could prejudice the <b>conduct of public affairs</b>	x



	8. Information that could endanger an individual's <b>health &amp; safety</b>	
	9. That is subject to <b>legal privilege</b>	
	10. That is prejudicial to <b>commercial interests</b>	
	11. That <b>may not be disclosed by law</b>	
	12. <b>Other</b> Please describe	



# Meeting Note

<b>Meeting</b>	Ipswich Garden Suburb – Strategic Rail Issues
<b>Date</b>	19 <sup>th</sup> November 2014
<b>Time</b>	10am
<b>Location</b>	Orwell Room, Grafton House – Ipswich Borough Council Offices
<b>Invited</b>	Geoff Gardner (Atlas) (Chair) (GG)  Andrew Tustin (Network Rail) (AT) Chris Fish (SCC Senior Development Control Engineer) (CF) Councillor Phil Smart (IBC Portfolio Holder: Environment & Transport) (PS) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Holly Radcliffe (Network Rail) (HR) Mark Knighting (IBC Senior Planning Officer) (MK) Matthew Ling (IBC Head of Development & Public Protection) (ML) Michael Newsham (IBC Integrated Transport Officer) (MN) Paul Oxley (Abellio Greater Anglia) (PO) Richard Crossland (Network Rail) (RCr) Rob Townsend (Network Rail) (RT) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Principal Planning Officer) (RCI) Sarah Conlan (Crest Nicholson) (SCon) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes) (SCoc)
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only

## Items:

1.	<b>Apologies received from:-</b>  Steve Day (Network Rail) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) James Farrar (Atlas) James Routledge (CBRE Investors) Kerry Allen (SCC)
----	---

	Leigh Collins (Network Rail)
2.	<b>Introductions</b>
3.	<p><b>Background to the Ipswich Garden Suburb (IGS) and purpose of the meeting.</b></p> <p>RC provided an overview of progress on the garden suburb including the SPD and current planning application from CBRE /Mersea Homes.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding when a likely start on the CBRE site would be made, SCoc advised it was likely by 2016.</p>
4.	<p><b>Westerfield Station and Felixstowe branch line improvements.</b></p> <p>HR provided an update on the Felixstowe line improvements – potential for freight train movements will rise from 30 to 48 per day. Improvements to accommodate this will all be made within Network Rail land if possible. Target is to complete improvements by April 2019. Still need to select a preferred option for improvements, prepare business case and go through Network Rail approval system.</p> <p>PS queried whether the increased freight traffic moving through the station would necessitate improvements to platforms &amp; crossing points to accommodate Ipswich passenger trains?</p> <p>HR acknowledged it would be good to improve the station but there are other viable options on the table that don't necessitate it.</p> <p>PS raised the benefits of moving the station closer to Fonnereau Way to enable a single crossing bridge for pedestrians to be created. RT advised that if a new station were to be required as a result of the freight improvement works, then Network Rail would look carefully at factors like this. He pointed out that it is extremely expensive – running into many millions of pounds - to move / build a new station.</p> <p>HR advised that the Felixstowe Capacity Enhancement Project will not alter the current passenger service between Ipswich and Felixstowe.</p> <p>New Fonnereau Way footbridge proposed in SPD welcomed by Network Rail (it was confirmed by IBC that the Ipswich Garden Suburb development does not include any proposals to replace the underbridge east of Westerfield Road).</p> <p>PO confirmed that infrastructure improvements would need to be in place before any service enhancement could take place. He advised that the current franchise will end October 2016 – stakeholder consultation on this starts next month &amp; local authorities should make representations regarding growth in locality, infrastructure challenges &amp; benefits of additional passengers. Currently there are no plans to improve parking or other facilities at Westerfield Station.</p> <p>MN pointed out the advantages of interlinking decisions on improving freight and passenger services where possible in respect of infrastructure upgrades, e.g. will potential for future electrification of the line be built in?</p> <p>RCr advised that the preferred improvement option would be selected by July 2015</p>

	<p>– it will however be difficult to signal what that option will be in advance. There are currently 3 options which all have a common impact on the Westerfield Station area. It is intended that the options are designed to fit within the Network Rail land so that they would not necessitate the relocation of Westerfield Station</p> <p>Improvement works will be future-proofed to include potential for electrification. If a new station were to be needed at Westerfield as a result of the works, it would likely be located on the west side of Westerfield Road (assuming it would fit within Network Rail land). It was noted that new stations are prohibitively expensive.</p>
5.	<p><b>Discuss delivery of the pedestrian and vehicle rail bridges proposed in the SPD masterplan.</b></p> <p>RT advised that in relation to constructing new bridges across the rail line, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design has to be acceptable;</li> <li>• Future adoption of bridges needs to be resolved. So far as any road bridges NR would require them to be adopted by the local authority or Highways Authority. Preference was for the same to apply to any footbridges;</li> <li>• Need asset protection agreement between key parties (Network Rail &amp; body undertaking bridge works) at the outset (this will also include agreement to pay for Network Rail costs in relation to bridge works) though Network Rail will usually hold one meeting before the agreement is signed to establish principles. Copies of Asset Protection Agreements on Network Rail website.</li> </ul> <p>RCr advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to allow at least a minimum of 1 year for design issues to be sorted. Would encourage engineering meeting as soon as possible;</li> <li>• Who designs and builds needs to be established early on. Network Rail can provide complete package to design and construct the bridges if requested;</li> <li>• Once works signed off, need to book track possessions to carry out works – this can take up to two years in advance and the cost will depend on whether it can be combined with other works which necessitate closure of line;</li> <li>• Two bridges will be treated differently as one is pedestrian and the other vehicular – it will also depend on whether it will need to carry additional services such as gas;</li> <li>• Foundations of both bridges should not sit on Network Rail land and bridges should be single span.</li> </ul> <p>GG raised the issue of ransom negotiations &amp; land value capture, RT advised that this was not a negotiation meeting and he did not have visibility of scheme requirements therefore it would be inappropriate to go into too much detail but he was content to run through the general principles that normally apply in such cases.</p> <p>Given public funding for Network Rail the ORR expects Network Rail to raise value from its assets which reduces the need for public subsidy. Network Rail would look to get a share in the uplift of land value resulting from bridges being in place – using well established and recognised principles established in the Stokes v Cambridge case. In some cases Network Rail will allow works to proceed in advance of values being agreed however generally developers prefer the certainty of knowing what the cost will be before undertaking the works.</p>



	<p>GG queried if the strategic nature of the road bridge would make a difference? RT advised that any negotiations that took place would factor in the nature of the crossing if it was genuinely strategic, however, in the absence of detailed knowledge of the scheme he couldn't say whether that applied here at this stage.</p> <p>CF queried if designing the Fonnereau Way bridge to permit cycle as well as pedestrian usage would be likely to increase value? Also, was Network Rail expecting Suffolk County Council to adopt the bridges?</p> <p>RT advised only if permitting cycle users as well as pedestrians was likely to increase land value uplift on either side then that would increase the value . With regard to adoption, this would need to be addressed between the parties but this would need to be resolved or bridges could not be built.</p> <p>SM emphasised that IBC wanted to work with all parties including Network Rail to secure delivery of strategic infrastructure.</p>
6.	<p><b>Discuss response from Network Rail to the CBRE/Mersea Homes planning application.</b></p> <p>SM expressed surprise to the Network Rail response given this required the level crossing to be closed and replaced with a bridge, which had not been raised during the consultation period on the masterplan and policies for the urban extension. Furthermore the Traffic Assessment concluded there would not be a significant increase in traffic along Westerfield Rd North so it is unclear what evidence Network Rail have considered in order to conclude that closure of the level crossing is necessary.</p> <p><b><i>(post meeting note: it was confirmed to RT by colleagues that NR had previously made the Council aware about the level crossing/bridges issues).</i></b></p> <p>Unfortunately Steve Day who is responsible for level crossings could not attend the meeting but RT advised that the developers of the sites would have been aware as of NR concerns as he had personally raised them with one of their consultants at least 4 or so years ago at a meeting.</p> <p>RT acknowledged concerns raised. He will contact Steve Day &amp; Elliott Stamp, and ask them to get in touch with RCI to arrange a specific meeting to discuss the response</p> <p>AT believed that the safety issues arose from the 'half barriers' currently at the crossing, which make it a higher risk crossing.</p> <p>MK advised that IBC were aware that there was a S106 Agreement attached to the Felixstowe Port works, which included improvement of the barriers at this crossing and needed to be looked into further.</p> <p>It was noted that some benefit to Network Rail may result from the provision of bridges in terms of removing risks and allowing speeds on the line to be increased, especially in light of the increased capacity for freight trains proposed.</p>
7.	<p><b>Maintaining communication and progress on IGS rail matters.</b></p>

	<p>Actions identified:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RCI to contact Steve Day &amp; Elliott Stamp to arrange a specific meeting to discuss the Network Rail response to the application.</li> <li>• MN will be the main liaison point between IBC and Network Rail on issues relating to Ipswich Garden Suburb – he will maintain regular contact with RT &amp; others.</li> <li>• MN to co-ordinate comments from IBC on the rail franchise consultation.</li> <li>• RCI to invite Network Rail to meetings of the Ipswich Garden Suburb Steering Group on an as-needs basis.</li> </ul>
8.	<p><b>Freedom of Information (FOI)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues raised in the meeting were identified as confidential under FOI.</li> </ul>
9.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CF queried if bridges that carried Public Rights of Way could be located at or within stations? RT advised that this was not normally the case because of access &amp; security issues. Although an example at Woodbridge was highlighted.</li> <li>• SCon advised that Crest had not undertaken any work on rail bridge design. Currently looking at traffic flow &amp; access to the Crest neighbourhood. Crest not intending to submit a planning application at this point.</li> </ul>

## **Ipswich Garden Suburb – Infrastructure Delivery Plan**

### **Steering Group Meeting – 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014**

1. Paragraph 7.21 of the Ipswich Garden Suburb Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out that the infrastructure required for the site can be divided into two categories: strategic infrastructure, which is required to mitigate the cumulative impact of the site and serve the whole development; and neighbourhood infrastructure, which primarily serves the needs of the new residents in the identified neighbourhood. It furthers that the delivery of strategic infrastructure will likely require a comprehensive approach from all landowners, whereas the neighbourhood infrastructure will be delivered by the landowners/developers of the specific neighbourhood. The strategic infrastructure that has been identified for the site is set out in Table 1 of the SPD.
  
2. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) submitted alongside the current application, is of concern to the Council as it has not involved the input of neighbouring landowners, nor does it identify how strategic items of infrastructure will be delivered. A suitable IDP which sets out how infrastructure will be delivered in order to support IGS development, is considered necessary in order to comply with policy CS10 and the SPD. This paper outlines the matters that still need to be addressed and form the basis for further discussion at the Development Steering Group meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014.
  
3. It is considered important that any approach by this Council to secure the delivery of strategic infrastructure does not result in any disproportionate financial loss or gain to the individual landowners/developers of the site. The Council's primary objective is to create a single integrated development, with the recognition that all parts of it will benefit from the overall package of strategic infrastructure.

4. Ultimately, what satisfies the tests for securing items of infrastructure (either by planning condition or obligations) is a matter of planning judgment and fact sensitive. Here the planning objective is the delivery of a single, sustainable and integrated urban expansion supported by a planned and comprehensive package of infrastructure. The proper planning of this area requires a comprehensive approach. The risk of a piecemeal approach is that the overall delivery of infrastructure might be prejudiced either because none of the component parts individually justifies a particular piece of infrastructure or because by the time the need can be demonstrated the remaining development cannot viably provide for this.
5. In conflict with the IDP as currently drafted, this Council is of the opinion that the responsibility of both the provision and financing of strategic infrastructure should not fall upon one developer simply because this has been identified on land within their ownership.

### **Proposal**

6. In order to progress an approach to overcome the concerns highlighted above, it is proposed that an approach to the delivery of strategic infrastructure is agreed and taken forward in a revised IDP which is based on the principle of infrastructure costs being proportioned fairly between development promoters. Each item of strategic infrastructure would then be taken responsibility of, by an identified development promoter using the contributions secured from other developers.
7. It is recognised that there is an emerging concern with a pooling approach to infrastructure, as from April 2015 the number of planning obligations that can be secured against a specific item (either direct provision or funding) will be limited to five. Furthermore, any obligations attached to applications made under Section 73 to vary a planning condition would also count towards this total. Given that there is likely to be either four or five 'red line' boundaries within the application site (the current application, Ipswich School land, Henley Gate and potentially two for Red House given

separate land ownerships), then any application to vary a condition on an earlier approval may prevent contributions being secured from later developments.

8. Another issue to be considered with a shared approach to fund infrastructure is the prediction of how costs are to be apportioned when the exact number of new dwellings is as yet unknown, whilst it is exceptionally difficult to arrive at a precise cost for certain items of infrastructure at this stage, although the difference in estimated and incurred costs by the delivering landowner could reasonably be balanced out in future viability reviews. It is considered that approaches to addressing these issues should be identified in the IDP.
  
9. With regard to the strategic items of infrastructure included in the SPD, some commentary on the role of a revised IDP in identifying necessary information has been provided in the table below. The apportionment of cost column assumes the information on dwelling numbers and phasing as contained in the IDP is accurate for the purpose of this note, although some aspects of this are queried.

Infrastructure theme	Strategic infrastructure & estimated cost formed as part of SPD viability work (i.e. indicative only)	Delivery & contributions	Apportionment of cost (based on IDP dwelling predictions & phasing)										
<b>Access &amp; transport</b>	<p>Vehicular rail crossing</p> <p><b>Capital cost of £4-6m, although this could vary quite considerably depending on ground conditions and height clearance.</b></p> <p><b>Network Rail design, application &amp; line closure fees may also apply.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should further explore these costs.</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP (<b>in consultation with all landowners, Network Rail &amp; SCC Highways</b>) should identify whether this is to be delivered by the Henley Gate developer or Network Rail, or clearly set out the range of possible options.</p> <p>As the construction of the bridge would enable the total development of the Henley Gate, it would be appropriate to secure the residual funding needed for its completion from the Henley Gate developer, with proportionate contributions on a per dwelling basis secured from all other developments (claw back mechanism for later developments).</p> <p>Details on how land, access and road link completion can be secured in Section 38 &amp; 106 agreements (separate to any ransom situation arising) to facilitate the delivery of the bridge is also required.</p>	<p>£5m (mid-estimate) divided between landowners:-</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£1,250,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£468,750</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£1,406,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>(+ £1.875m to be refunded)</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£1,875,000</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>(claw back)</b></p>	CBRE	£1,250,000	Ipswich School	£468,750	Crest	£1,406,250	<b>(+ £1.875m to be refunded)</b>		Mersea	£1,875,000
	CBRE	£1,250,000											
Ipswich School	£468,750												
Crest	£1,406,250												
<b>(+ £1.875m to be refunded)</b>													
Mersea	£1,875,000												
<p>Fonnereau Way cycle/pedestrian bridge across rail line</p> <p><b>Capital cost of £500k-£1.5m, although this could vary as per above.</b></p> <p><b>Network Rail design, application &amp; line closure fees may also apply.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should further explore these costs.</b></p>	<p>The construction of this would be required either to enable the development of Fonnereau or the total development of Henley Gate, subject to the robustness of Network Rail's consultation response to the current planning application.</p> <p>The revised IDP should identify the various delivery options, <b>in consultation with all landowners, Abellio Greater Anglia, Network Rail, Michael Newsham (IBC) &amp; SCC Highways/RoW</b>. It would be appropriate to secure either the full or residual funding needed for its completion from Fonnereau/Henley Gate developer, with proportionate contributions on a per dwelling basis secured from all other developments.</p> <p>Details on how land, access and footpath link completion can be</p>	<p>£1m (mid-estimate) divided between landowners:-</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£250,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£93,750</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£281,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£375,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>Delivery point tbc.</p>	CBRE	£250,000	Ipswich School	£93,750	Crest	£281,250	Mersea	£375,000			
CBRE	£250,000												
Ipswich School	£93,750												
Crest	£281,250												
Mersea	£375,000												

		secured in Section 38 & 106 agreements (separate to any ransom situation arising) to facilitate the delivery of the bridge is also required.								
<p>Phased delivery of bus services &amp; bus priority measures.</p> <p><b>Indicative off-site costs of £250k. Measures on Bolton Lane likely needed, whilst other provision would be informed by the routes that buses would take (e.g. use of Museum Street).</b></p> <p><b>Bus service subsidy of £125k per bus per annum, with five buses funded for 5 years at £3.125m.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should identify specific requirements and costs.</b></p>	<p>Where requisite mitigation for off-site priority measures has been identified by the revised IDP/TA (<b>IDP in consultation with all landowners, Ipswich bus operators, Michael Newsham and SCC Highways</b>), contributions should be secured on a per dwelling basis or in full by those developments that would trigger the requirement for such measures to be in place, with proportionate contributions secured from later developments.</p> <p>On-site bus priority measures and associated bus infrastructure (e.g. stops, lay-bys and temporary turning circles) should be met by individual developers and included as a neighbourhood site cost.</p> <p>Contributions towards new bus services can likely be apportioned on a per dwelling basis within each individual S106 Agreement, subject to an appropriately phased delivery programme in the IDP.</p>	<p>£3.375m divided between landowners:-</p> <table> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£843,750</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£316,406</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£949,219</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£1,265,625</td> </tr> </table> <p>Delivery point tbc.</p>	CBRE	£843,750	Ipswich School	£316,406	Crest	£949,219	Mersea	£1,265,625
CBRE	£843,750									
Ipswich School	£316,406									
Crest	£949,219									
Mersea	£1,265,625									
<p>Improvements to strategic town centre &amp; east-west footpaths/cycleways</p> <p><b>£725k, which is based on technical work carried out by AECOM. Includes Valley Road longitudinal, Valley Road crossing, Park Road, Park road/Henley Road jnc, Bridleway from Henley Road to Fonnereau Road, Fonnereau Road, Christchurch Park, route to ASDA area, Bolton Lane, Tuddenham Road &amp; Henley Road.</b></p> <p><b>IDP/TA should identify specific requirements and costs.</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP/TA should identify the extent and timings of required improvements (<b>IDP in consultation with all landowners &amp; SCC Highways/RoW</b>).</p> <p>Contributions may be apportioned on a per dwelling basis within each individual S106 agreement, subject to an appropriately phased delivery programme in the IDP.</p>	<p>£725k divided between landowners:-</p> <table> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£181,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£67,969</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£203,906</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£271,875</td> </tr> </table> <p>Delivery point tbc.</p>	CBRE	£181,250	Ipswich School	£67,969	Crest	£203,906	Mersea	£271,875
CBRE	£181,250									
Ipswich School	£67,969									
Crest	£203,906									
Mersea	£271,875									

	<p>Improvements to Westerfield Station and level-crossing</p> <p><b>Unknown – IDP should identify specific requirements and costs.</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP/TA should identify the extent and timings of required improvements (<b>IDP in consultation with all landowners, Network Rail, Abellio Greater Anglia, Michael Newsham &amp; SCC Highways</b>). This will determine whether any development is required in Fonnereau to support station enhancements (e.g. a car park), and/or whether contributions towards specifically identified items of infrastructure (e.g. level crossing upgrade, cycle parking) should be secured on a per dwelling basis or in full by those developments that would trigger the requirement for identified measures to be in place, with proportionate contributions secured from later developments.</p>	<p>Requirements, cost and delivery points tbc.</p>								
	<p>Controlled cycle/pedestrian crossing on Westerfield Road</p> <p><b>Approx. £160k.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should identify specific requirement and cost.</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP/TA (<b>IDP in consultation with all landowners, SCC Highways &amp; Education</b>) should identify the type and position of this crossing (or multiples thereof). This will likely be delivered by SCC Highways with contributions secured in full prior to first building occupation in Red House neighbourhood. As this would enable the development of Red House, residual funding should be secured from the first Red House developer, with proportionate contributions secured from all other developments (unless these have already been paid).</p>	<p>£160k divided between landowners:-</p> <table data-bbox="1691 659 1989 783"> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£40,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£15,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£45,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£60,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>Delivery point on first building occupation of Red House (assuming Fonnereau has commenced).</p>	CBRE	£40,000	Ipswich School	£15,000	Crest	£45,000	Mersea	£60,000
CBRE	£40,000										
Ipswich School	£15,000										
Crest	£45,000										
Mersea	£60,000										
	<p>Traffic management scheme for Westerfield village, The Crofts and other locations</p> <p><b>Provision dependent on TA findings. Likely needed to dissuade use of identified routes. £80k for Westerfield village and £200k for The Crofts given as approximate costs.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should identify specific requirements and costs.</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP/TA should identify the extent and timings of required improvements (<b>IDP in consultation with all landowners &amp; SCC Highways</b>). This will determine whether contributions should be secured on a per dwelling basis or in full by those developments that would trigger the requirement for identified measures to be in place, with proportionate contributions secured from later developments.</p>	<p>£280k divided between landowners:-</p> <table data-bbox="1691 1062 2000 1187"> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£70,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£26,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£78,750</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£105,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>Delivery point tbc.</p>	CBRE	£70,000	Ipswich School	£26,250	Crest	£78,750	Mersea	£105,000
CBRE	£70,000										
Ipswich School	£26,250										
Crest	£78,750										
Mersea	£105,000										



<p><b>Education</b></p>	<p>1200 space secondary school (including sixth form facility) with site providing playing fields and recreational facilities that would be secured for use by the community</p> <p><b>£3,483 contribution per dwelling. This may be slightly refined based on review on school size.</b></p> <p><b>£1m estimated for enhanced sports pitch provision – the SPD outlines that part of the 12ha requirements for the site will be provided on school sites in the form of all-weather pitches etc.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should identify specific requirements and costs.</b></p>	<p>The IDP <b>(in consultation with all landowners &amp; SCC Education)</b> should identify the various options for securing a serviced site with access roads.</p> <p>Contributions will be apportioned on a per dwelling basis within each individual S106 agreement.</p>	<p>1,200 pupil school build cost given as £19m. On basis of 0.22 pupils per dwelling, 5,455no. dwellings equates to full school.</p> <p>£19m / 5,455 = £3,483 per dwelling, equating to £11.15m for SPD site.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£2,786,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£1,044,900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£3,134,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£4,179,600</td> </tr> </table>	CBRE	£2,786,400	Ipswich School	£1,044,900	Crest	£3,134,700	Mersea	£4,179,600
CBRE	£2,786,400										
Ipswich School	£1,044,900										
Crest	£3,134,700										
Mersea	£4,179,600										
<p><b>Open space, recreation &amp; play</b></p>	<p>Country Park with joint visitor / community centre for Henley Gate</p> <p><b>Country Park capital cost £1.515m; community centre capital cost £779k.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should identify specific requirements and costs, to include maintenance.</b></p>	<p>The IDP <b>(in consultation with all landowners, IBC Parks &amp; Natural England/Suffolk Wildlife Trust where applicable)</b> should identify an appropriate delivery programme for the Park facility.</p> <p>Contributions should be secured on a per dwelling basis or in full by those developments that would trigger the requirement for identified measures to be in place, with proportionate contributions secured from later developments. Residual funding for the community centre will be secured from the Henley Gate developer, with proportionate contributions secured from all other developments.</p>	<p>£2.294m divided between landowners:-</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£573,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£215,063</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£645,188</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£860,250</td> </tr> </table> <p>Various delivery points.</p>	CBRE	£573,500	Ipswich School	£215,063	Crest	£645,188	Mersea	£860,250
CBRE	£573,500										
Ipswich School	£215,063										
Crest	£645,188										
Mersea	£860,250										
	<p>Swimming contribution (off-site)</p> <p><b>£360 per dwelling based on Sport England calculator.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should identify specific</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP <b>(in consultation with all landowners and IBC Sport &amp; Leisure)</b> should identify enhancement opportunities to off-site facilities.</p> <p>Contributions may be apportioned on a per dwelling basis within each individual S106 agreement, subject to an appropriately</p>	<p>£360 per dwelling:-</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£288,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£108,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£324,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£432,000</td> </tr> </table>	CBRE	£288,000	Ipswich School	£108,000	Crest	£324,000	Mersea	£432,000
CBRE	£288,000										
Ipswich School	£108,000										
Crest	£324,000										
Mersea	£432,000										

	<b>requirement and cost.</b>	phased delivery programme in the IDP.	Delivery point tbc.								
<b>Community facilities</b>	<p>District &amp; Local Centres including community buildings with integrated library facilities &amp; police office (where required) alongside new health centre &amp; reserved sites for community use</p> <p><b>DC community centre, indicative cost of £1.558m to include: main hall &amp; other rooms suitable for range of uses; 60sqm for police office &amp; other identified space requirements; library facility (as required by SCC); reception/circulation, workspace hub, equipment store, changing/wc facilities, rest room/kitchen (staff use), meeting rooms, plant room etc.</b></p> <p><b>Health centre serviced site of 0.2ha site (inclusive of parking) and pro-rata contributions of £338 per dwelling.</b></p> <p><b>IDP should identify specific requirements and costs, to include maintenance of community centre.</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP <b>(in consultation with all landowners, Suffolk Constabulary, NHS England, IBC Community Engagement, SCC Highways &amp; Libraries)</b> should identify the extent of provision in each centre.</p> <p>Full or residual contributions towards the construction of community buildings and associated infrastructure will be secured from the landowning developer, with proportionate contributions secured from all other developments.</p> <p>The clearance and servicing of the reserved health centre and two community use sites should be met by individual developers and included as a neighbourhood site cost.</p> <p>Contributions towards the capital cost of the health centre secured on a per dwelling basis, in line with NHS Health Impact Assessment methodology.</p>	<p>Community centre capital (£1.558m) + health centre contributions (£338 per dwelling) divided between landowners:-</p> <table> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£659,900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£247,463</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£742,388</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£989,850</td> </tr> </table> <p>Various delivery points.</p>	CBRE	£659,900	Ipswich School	£247,463	Crest	£742,388	Mersea	£989,850
CBRE	£659,900										
Ipswich School	£247,463										
Crest	£742,388										
Mersea	£989,850										
	<p>Funding for community development support officer(s)</p> <p><b>£300k – approximate cost covering resources &amp; salary for 10 years.</b></p>	<p>The revised IDP <b>(in consultation with all landowners and IBC Community Engagement)</b> should identify appropriate funding and period for officer in post.</p> <p>Contributions can likely be apportioned on a per dwelling basis within each individual S106 agreement.</p>	<p>£300k divided between landowners:-</p> <table> <tr> <td>CBRE</td> <td>£75,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ipswich School</td> <td>£28,125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crest</td> <td>£84,375</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mersea</td> <td>£112,500</td> </tr> </table> <p>Delivery point tbc.</p>	CBRE	£75,000	Ipswich School	£28,125	Crest	£84,375	Mersea	£112,500
CBRE	£75,000										
Ipswich School	£28,125										
Crest	£84,375										
Mersea	£112,500										

<b>Utilities</b>	Any strategic improvements to electricity & gas supply  <b>Costs unknown – IDP to identify.</b>	Details required in revised IDP. However, this is unlikely to be an item for inclusion in a S106 agreement, unless otherwise identified by landowners.	Apportionment opportunity to be identified where necessary & practicable.
	Any strategic improvements to water supply  <b>Costs unknown – IDP to identify.</b>	Details required in revised IDP. However, this is unlikely to be an item for inclusion in a S106 agreement, unless otherwise identified by landowners.	Apportionment opportunity to be identified where necessary & practicable.
	Any strategic improvements to the sewerage system  <b>Costs unknown – IDP to identify.</b>	Details required in revised IDP. However, this is unlikely to be an item for inclusion in a S106 agreement, unless otherwise identified by landowners.	Apportionment opportunity to be identified where necessary & practicable.
	Any strategic infrastructure needed to deliver low carbon development  <b>Costs unknown – IDP to identify.</b>	Details required in revised IDP. This can likely be secured by site-specific planning conditions or S106 agreement.	Apportionment opportunity to be identified where necessary & practicable.
	Strategic SuDS infrastructure & connections  <b>Capital &amp; maintenance costs unknown – IDP to identify.</b>	Details required in revised IDP. This can likely be secured by site-specific planning conditions or S106 agreement, unless otherwise identified by landowners.	Apportionment opportunity to be identified where necessary & practicable.

## **Summary**

10. There is a clear need to secure both contributions and the delivery mechanism for the strategic items of infrastructure that are required to support the comprehensive development of the Ipswich Garden Suburb within the various Section 106 agreements for the site. At the present time, the IDP does not facilitate this process and its position that key items of infrastructure will wholly be delivered and financed by individual landowners is not acceptable (an indicative list of strategic infrastructure items for which the costs would need to be apportioned between the landowners of the site is included as Appendix 1).
11. Moreover, the IDP is not informed by the views of all promoters and landowners of the site to ascertain dwelling numbers, build out rates and agreements on how land and access will be made available for the delivery of the two railway bridges, Country Park and high school in particular. In addition, the processes to secure permission from Network Rail for the construction of the two bridges and the views of Network Rail, Abellio Greater Anglia, local bus operators, the NHS and various local authority service providers have not been included to provide indications of updated requirements, cost, lead-in periods etc. of the strategic items.
12. In view of the above, further work is necessary to explore each strategic item of infrastructure in more detail with the various parties (as outlined in the above table) in order to update the specific requirements and determine methods of delivery. In particular, the indicative costs of strategic items of infrastructure need to be refined so that these are fit for inclusion in landowner and/or Section 106 agreements, with any necessary contingency and procedures for demonstrating end costs being built in to this. This would require the input of a cost consultant.
13. It is intended that such processes would inform a revised version of the submitted IDP, and the content of which would need to be underpinned by a Memorandum of Understanding (or similar agreement) between the

promoters and landowners of the site. This could further inform the drafting of Section 106 agreements for each neighbourhood.

### **Actions**

- Responses to the proposal with a view to agreeing the principle of cost sharing and delivery.
- Costs to be refined and tested to aid viability work. How this is to be undertaken and by who, needs to be agreed.
- Missing information relating to details of the infrastructure provision and timings as highlighted in the earlier table, to be confirmed and used to inform a project plan with timetable for each element of strategic infrastructure.

## **Appendix 1**

Whilst contributions towards some of the strategic items can be secured on a per dwelling basis throughout each phase of the development, the following items are likely to be needed at set points linked to neighbourhood commencement and dwelling occupations. It is these items of infrastructure (and any further to be identified for inclusion) where an agreement on the apportionment of cost and claw back mechanisms between the landowners should be sought:-

£5,000,000	Vehicular bridge (mid-estimate capital cost)
£1,000,000	Cycle/pedestrian bridge (mid-estimate capital cost)
£250,000	Bus priority measures (off-site)
£725,000	Improvements to strategic town centre & east-west footpaths/cycleways
£?	Improvements to Westerfield Station and level-crossing
£160,000	Controlled cycle/pedestrian crossing on Westerfield Road
£280,000	Traffic management scheme for Westerfield village, The Crofts and other locations
£2,294,000	County Park & visitor facility/community centre (capital cost only)
£1,558,000	DC community centre (capital cost only)
<u>£?</u>	Utility upgrades (where necessary & practicable)
<b>£11,267,000+</b>	<b>Total</b>